DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 191 095 CS 502 975

AUTHOR Brown, Lydia Ledesma: Emry, Robert A.
TITLE Communication and Culture: Interpersonal Attraction.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 32p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Communication Association (Portland, OR, February 16-20, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults: Behavioral Science Research: Blacks: Comparative Analysis: *Cultural Differences: Factor Analysis: Friendship: Helping Relationship: *Individual Needs: *Interpersonal Attraction: *Interpersonal Relationship: Mexican Americans: *Needs Assessment: Whites
IDENTIFIERS Communication Research

ABSTRACT

Cultural differences in interpersonal attraction were studied using 93 black, 112 Chicano, and 112 white college students who completed 40 Likert-type rating scales for each of four concepts of attraction (intimate, friendship, acquaintance, and stranger attraction). When a factor solution was generated, differences were noted in the amount of variance accounted for by the composite population and by each of the subgroups. When similar factors were identified across the sample populations, these factors accounted for differing amounts of variance, suggesting that the three cultural groups placed differing degrees of importance on factors contributing to interpersonal attraction. In general, the black students made more holistic assessments and did not differentiate among task attractiveness, social/physical attractiveness, and affective/cognitive attractiveness. The Chicano students appeared to have accepted more responsibility in facilitating the growth of the attractive other person, while the black and the white students considered attractiveness dependent on the other person's ability to facilitate another's growth. The white students seemed more concerned than the other cultural groups that the other person in the relationship possess generalized respect and a societal commitment. (RL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED191095

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Communication and Culture:

Interpersonal Attraction

by

Lydia Ledesma Brown

and

Robert A. Emry

California State University, Fullerton

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lydia Ledesma Brown
Robert A. Emry

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Submitted to:

"Intercultural Communication Interest Group"

Western Speech Communication Convention

Portland, Oregon, 1980

CS502975

INTRODUCTION

Theorists have not agreed on a single definition of attraction. Yet most agree that interpersonal attraction is "a positive or negative attitude toward another person" (Berscheid and Walster, 1978, p. 1). Similarly, theorists do not agree on the principles which underly attraction although reinforcement, perceived similarity, proximity and equity theory consistently emerge in the literature as important facilitators of interpersonal attraction.

Interpersonal attraction exerts a strong influence on communication relationships. Brooks suggests that, "when there are strong, positive relationships between persons, a high probability exists that communication between them will be successful; but when there is a strong dislike between persons, communication will be severely handicapped" (1978, p. 145).

According to McCroskey, Larsen, and Knapp (1971), "interpersonal communication exists for the primary purpose of enhancing interpersonal attraction." The authors go on to define interpersonal attraction as "judgments about whether we 'like' another person, whether we 'feel good' in his presence" (p. 38). Byrne and Griffitt (1973) refer to interpersonal attraction as "affective evaluation of another individual" (p. 318). Burgoon, Heston, and McCroskey (1974) suggest that "interpersonal attraction is the degree to which Person A likes Person B, desires to associate with or spend

time with Person B, and enjoys being in the presence of Person B" (p. 98). Brooks suggests that interpersonal attraction and affection refer to "the positive attitude persons share, the moving toward, or the liking one person has for another" (1978, p. 145). Wilmot argues that "the basic degrees of feelings ranging between liking and disliking another -- the degrees of attraction -- are produced by a host of factors" (1975, p. 68). Numerous research findings tend to support these observations.

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION AND RELATED FACTORS

Byrne (1971), Heider (1958), and Newcomb (1961) emphasize the role played by perceived similarities in attitudes and background in the generation of attraction (Berger, Weber, Munley, and Dixon, 1977, p. 245). Similarity has been related to attraction and involves such factors as attitudes (Bleda, 1973, p. 154), economic background (Byrne et al., 1966), defense mechanisms (Byrne et al., 1967), and self-concept (Griffitt, 1966; Hendrick and Page, 1970; Seygried and Hendrick, 1973, p. 207). Sote and Good (1974) found that similarity in self-disclosure between strangers for highly self-disclosive females was related to attraction. Brislin (1971) studied friendship choices and seating patterns and made predictions about the amount of interaction based on objective similarities between

nine specific culture groups. The findings suggest that belief similarity leads to ease and comfort in interaction.

Byrne (1961) studied affiliation in conjunction with attitude similarity in interpersonal attraction. The author found that (1) a stranger with attitudes similar to those of the target person was rated equally positively by individuals possessing high or low affiliation need, (2) a stranger with attitudes dissimilar to those of the target person was rated significantly more negatively on both measures of interpersonal attraction by individuals high in need for affiliation than by those low in need for affiliation, and (3) a stranger with attitudes similar to those of the target person was rated as better liked, a more desirable work partner, more intelligent, better informed about current events, more moral, and better adjusted than a stranger with dissimilar attitudes (p. 288).

Seyfried and Hendrick (1973) examined need similarity and complementarity and employed Winch's (1958, 1963) conceptual framework. In the Seyfried and Hendrick study, an attempt was made to create a situation in which the joint effects of both need similarity and need complementarity on attraction could be assessed. The results demonstrated strong effects for need similarity, but only slight effects for need complementarity.

Freeman (1977) investigated the effect of obligation upon attraction. The reward explanation holds that the more rewards

one person provides another, the more the person will be "liked" (p. 57). Reciprocity formulation states "that the donor who gives benefits without seeking a return violates a norm and arouses negative reactions in the recipient" (p. 57). Yet the results of this study imply that the greater the reward at the least cost, the greater attraction. Altman and Taylor (1973), Homans (1961), and Thibaut and Kelley (1959) highlight the role that rewards and costs play in the development of interpersonal attraction (Berger et al., p. 245).

Not only have researchers attempted to identify factors which facilitate interpersonal attraction but they have also attempted to isolate the determinants of the construct. Sereno and Bodaken (1975) describe three types of attraction: (1) affection; (2) respect; and (3) love. Berger, Weber, Munley, and Dixon (1977) explored how the various dimensions of attractiveness varied across the relationship levels of formal acquaintance, friend, close friend, and lover roles. Three dimensions emerged from their analyses: sociability, character, and supportiveness. Triandis (1964) reported give dimensions of interpersonal attraction. The first factor was identified as social acceptance. This factor relates to the task property of the construct. The second factor identified relates to a socio-emotional consideration. The other three factors identified by the researcher contain only single scales and were of questionable reliability.

Kiesler and Goldberg (1968) found two factors relating to the construct of attraction: (1) a socio-emotional dimension of interpersonal attraction (closely related to "liking"), and (2) a task dimension of interpersonal attraction (closely related to "respect"). McCroskey and McCrain (1972) support the view that interpersonal attraction is a multidimensional construct and identified three factors of interpersonal attraction: (1) social attraction (a personal liking factor), (2) physical attraction (an appearance factor based upon dress and physical characteristics), and (3) task attraction (a respect factor based upon how easy or worthwhile working with a particular individual would be).

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION AND CULTURE

Although attraction has been defined and studied in many different ways, attraction is a construct which is assigned by the receiver based upon his/her perceptions of another person. Therefore, attraction is a perceived attribute and parallels person perception. Person perception involves the process of attaching meaning to another's behavior (Wilmot, 1975, p. 68). Because interpersonal attraction is a perceived behavioral attribution, it is subject to many of the same influences that shape other aspects of behavior. In particular, each individual's experiences combine in a complex fashion to determine his or her reactions to a given stimulus situation.

If interpersonal attraction is a perceived behavioral attribute subject to some of the same factors as behavior, then the determinants of interpersonal attraction can be expected to vary across cultures. For example, Marshall Singer suggests that when essentially the same perceptions are shared by a number of people an identity group can be said to exist. The identity group's strength depends upon the quantity and quality of the perceptions shared. The members of a group recognize their identity and they reinforce it through communication. This reinforcement via communication enables them to deal with one another in a special way and to facilitate the perpetuation of the group and cultural identification. Any identity group can be said to have its own culture, a pattern of behavior established by a group of people who share significant perceptions of the external world (Singer, 1969, pp. 15-22). These shared perceptions and the sense of identity resulting from them are reinforced through communication. Therefore, just as the individual creates his or her personal reality, the group creates a cultural reality (Klapper, 1967-8, pp. 453-74). Once an identity group is established, it tends to shape the experiences of the individual and mediates the individual's perceptions of external reality. Perceptions, thus, become behavior that is learned, shared, and mediated by communication. Culture, a code which persons learn and share, requires communication. In addition, communication requires coding

and symbols, also learned and shared. Therefore, communication and culture are inseparable (Smith, 1966, p. 7). Thus perception can be considered as an aspect of human behavior, and as such, it is subject to many of the same influences that shape other aspects of behavior. "In building general theories of human behavior, we most often do not know whether we are dealing with a universal phenomenon or with something which is culture specific" (Byrne et al., 1971, p. 201).

Blanchard, Aldeman and Cook (1975) found that the degree of liking and respect among members of cooperating interracial groups was found to be influenced by the success or failure of the group in achieving its goal. When cooperative endeavors were successful, respect and liking for groupmates were greater than when the group failed. Another study done by Blanchard and Cook (1976) examined the effects of helping a less competent member of a cocperating interracial group on the helper's attraction for the recipient of his/her help. The results provided support for the inference that personally helping a less competent co-member in a cooperating group leads to increased liking and respect for the recipient of the help. The subjects who were induced to help the less competent group members also felt significantly greater satisfaction with the group experience than did subjects who merely observed the helping behavior. On the basis of the present findings, it would appear that at least some

form of helping produces feelings of satisfaction and attraction in the helper. These conclusions are consistent with Blanchard, Weigel, and Cook's (1975) findings.

While these studies indicate that interracial attraction exists, they provide little understanding of how differing cultures might view the concept of interpersonal attraction.

This study is designed to ascertain the impact of cultural differences on the determinants of interpersonal attraction. To become more effective in communicating across cultures, we need to assess whether or not interpersonal attraction varies from culture to culture. Therefore, this study will sample three populations: Black-Americans, Chicano-Americans, and White-Americans. It is hypothesized that the determinants of interpersonal attraction are partly a function of cultural differences.

PROCEDURES

This study involved two phases. The first phase was utilized to construct the test instrument. Seventy-five Black-Americans, Chicano-Americans, and White-Americans participated in this phase of the study. Each subject was asked to respond to an open-ended question which stated, "Think about a person you do not know well, but would like to know better. What is it about this person that causes you to want to know him/her better?" The subjects were

then asked to list descriptive characteristics which impacted their attraction for the other person. The lists of characteristics generated by the three samples were content analyzed separately. The frequency with which each characteristic appeared was noted. The population-derived characteristics were utilized in the construction of Likert-like items on a seven-point scale and were pooled with scales drawn from the McCroskey and McCain (1972) study. This initial pool of derived and standardized scale items was reduced by three criteria: (1) the frequency of occurrence of sample characteristics, (2) sample evaluation of these characteristics, and (3) two standardized scales from each dimension identified in the McCroskey and McCain study. The 40 scale items met the three criteria. These 40 scale items were used as rating scales in the second phase of this study. Of these 40 scale items, 34 were derived scales, six were standardized scales, and two were standardized-derived. The standardized-derived scales are representative of scales which appeared in both the derived scales list and in the recommended list of standardized scales.

The purpose of the second phase was to investigate the impact of culture on the factor structure of sample judgments regarding interpersonal attraction. Data in the second phase were collected from 317 subjects from five Southern California colleges and universities. Each subject represented one

of three sample populations: (1) 93 Black-Americans; (2) 112 Chicano-Americans; and (3) 112 White-Americans.

The subjects who participated in the second phase were given a test instrument which contained instructions and four concepts, each of which was followed by forty scales. The four concepts were as follows: (1) intimate attraction; (2) friendship attraction; (3) acquaintance attraction; and (4) stranger attraction. The polarity of each statement was assigned via a table of random numbers.

These judgmental responses were analyzed by Principle Component and rotated by a Kaiser Normalization rotation. An eigenvalue of 2.0 was established as the criterion for termination of factor extraction. For an item to be defined as loading on a resulting factor, a loading of .50 or higher was required. For a factor to be considered meaningful the a priori requirement was set that at least two scales must load on that factor and the factor must explain two percent of the total variance.

A factor solution was generated for each of the following data groupings: the Composite Sample Population, the Black-American Sample Population, the Chicano-American Sample Population, and the White-American Sample Population. The Composite does not represent a different population but rather the judgmental evaluations of all three sample populations. Therefore, four factor solutions were generated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In assessing the impact of the population sampled on interpersonal attraction, the four factor solutions generated were compared. The technique utilized in this study for this comparison was based upon observation rather than statistical tests. Raymond B. Cattell suggests that mathematical statisticians disagree about expressions for significance of loading factors as a whole and for differences in loadings (1966, p. 331). Given the confusion about the statistical weakness of present tests for "the factor matching problem," the intuitive mode of factor comparison was utilized. R. J. Rummel suggests that the intuitive approach is perhaps the most common, entails a visual comparison of factor loadings and a judgment of their similarity, and is as functional as systematic (statistical) modes of factor comparisons (1970, pp. 171-2). For these reasons, judgments about sample factor solution similarities and dissimilarities were based upon: (1) the relative completeness of factor solutions; (2) the order of factor extraction; and (3) consistency of scale loadings. Groupings of factors to be compared were selected on the basis of similar factor patterns identified across sample solutions. That is, the first factor of the Composite solution was compared with all possible factors of the Chicano-American solution. When similar factor patterns

were ascertained, these two similar factors were compared with all the factors of the Black-American solution and the White-American solution. This procedure was repeated until all similar factor patterns across the four solutions had been identified.

The Principle Component Factor Analysis and Oblique Rotation Factor Solution for the Composite data generated a three-factor solution which accounted for 34.6 percent of the total variance. Similarly, the Chicano-American and the Black-American data generated a three-factor solution which accounts for 34.9 percent and 35.6 percent of the total variance, respectively. Only two of the three factors were interpretable for the Black-American solution. The White-American data generated a four-factor solution which accounted for 42.3 percent of the total variance. Only three of the four factors were interpretable. A visual examination of these four solutions indicated the existence of three groupings of similar factors (see Tables I, II, and III). These groups are as follows: (1) Factors I, III, I, II and I of the Composite, Chicano-American, Black-American, Black-American, and White-American solutions; (2) Factor II of the Composite, Chicano-American and White-American solutions; and (3) Factors II, I, I, and III of the Composite, Chicano-American, Black-American, and White-American solutions, respectively.

TABLE I

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION ACROSS POPULATIONS

	Comparison I Factor	Composite I	Chicano III	Blacks I	Blacks II	Whites I
2	Similar Interests	.65398	.63830			.73892
4	Charming*			.64907		
12	Could help me improve as a person			.54038		.50625
13	Fun				.52152	.59739
15	I can help this person		.57964			
20	Ability to get the job done			.55262		
22	Good communicator**			.53552		
23	Makes me feel good	-.51860			.52576	.69257
24	Keeps busy			.53012		
25	Handsome (pretty)***			.52022		
27	Similar backgrounds				.50398	
28	Could be a friend of mine	.61337		.74144		.66195
29	Warm, sensitive feeling individual	.60771		.64615		.72509
33	Understanding	.55259		.68024		.69621
34	Similar view	.68963	.64139			.76898
37	Friendly			.73212		.57161
39	Intelligent			.76052		
	Total Variance	24.6%	4.8%	24.3%	6.8%	25.6%
	Common Variance	76.9%	10.3%	74.6%	16.5%	65.3%

* Loaded on Factor II for White solution.

** Loaded on Factors III and I for the Composite and Chicano solutions respectively.

*** Loaded on Factor II for all other solutions.

TABLE II

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION ACROSS POPULATIONS

	Comparison II Factor	Composite II	Chicano II	Black	White II
4	Charming*				-.56658
9	Sexy looking	.73466			.83281
19	Nice		.71613		
25	Handsome (pretty)*	-.64776	.65981		-.81842
31	Physically attractive	.75306	.78846		.84476
	Total Variance	5.5%	5.7%		6.9%
	Common Variance	13.7%	13.9%		15.5%

* Loaded on Factor I for Black solution.

TABLE III

INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION ACROSS POPULATIONS

	Comparison III Factor	Composite III	Chicano I	Blacks I	Whites III
4	Charming*			.64907	
10	Not respected by others				-.50068
12	Could help improve me as a person			.54038	
20	Ability to get the job done	-.51515	.56922	.55262	.54381
21	Close to the same age	-.69473			
22	Good communicator	-.50936	.55299	.53552	
24	Keeps busy	-.50596		.53012	.55334
25	Quite handsome (pretty)**			.52022	
28	Could be a friend of mine			.74144	
29	Person is warm, sensitive, feeling individual			.64615	
30	Independent	.51883	-.57526		
32	Participating in the improvement of society				.55098
33	Understanding			.68024	
37	Friendly			.73212	
39	Intelligent		.63369	.76052	
	Total Variance	4.6%	24.4%	24.3%	5.7%
	Common Variance	9.7%	75.7%	74.6%	11.3%

* Loaded on Factor II for the White solution.

** Loaded on Factor II for the Composite, Chicano and White solutions.

The order of factor extraction for the first grouping of similar factors was the same for the Composite, Black-American, and White-American solutions while the third factor of the Chicano-American factor solution was identified first. In addition, two factors of the Black-American solution were identified in this grouping of similar factors. The second grouping of similar factors demonstrated the same order of factor extraction for the Composite, Chicano-American and White-American solutions. The second factor of the Black-American solution shared one scale loading with the other identified factors. The third grouping of similar factors implied a different order of factor extraction. In this comparison the third factors of the Composite and White-American solutions were identified while Factor I was identified for the Chicano-American and Black-American solutions.

Collectively, the first grouping of similar factors in the attribution of interpersonal attraction demonstrates an "affective/cognitive" component. The Composite factor suggests that the attractive other should share similar interests and views and should be a warm and supportive person. The Chicano-American factor indicates a concern with similar interests and views but also demonstrates that the perceiver is concerned about his/her ability to help the attractive other. The first factor of the Black-American solution,

the Composite factor, and the White-American factor all demonstrate a concern that the other be understanding and supportive. In addition, the Black-Americans indicate a need for the other to be charming, friendly, handsome (pretty) and intelligent as well as a competent worker and communicator who gets things done. The second Black-American factor indicates that the other should be fun-loving and of similar background. The White-American factor parallels the Composite factor but in addition implies that the attractive other should have the ability to "help me improve as a person," as well as be fun and friendly. Collectively, 17 scales loaded on one or more of these four factors. The Composite, the Chicano-American and the White-American factors shared one common scale loading while the Composite, the Black-American and the White-American factors shared five common scale loadings. One scale loaded on the following factors: Composite, the Chicano-American and the White-American. One scale loaded only on the Composite and the Chicano-American factors while seven additional scale loadings were shared by the Black-American and White-American factors. Two scale loadings were unique to the Black-American factors and one was unique to the Chicano-American factor. The Composite factor accounted for 24.6 percent of the total variance and 76.9 percent of the common variance; the Chicano-American factor accounted for 24.4 percent of the

total variance and 75.7 percent of the common variance; the two Black-American factors accounted for 24.3 and 6.8 percent of the total variance and 74.6 and 16.5 percent of the common variance, respectively; while the White-American factor accounted for 25.6 and 65.3 percent of the total and common variance, respectively.

The second group of similar factors was comprised of the second factors of the Composite, the Chicano-American and the White-American solutions. One scale, "handsome/ pretty," which loaded on these three factors, also loaded on the second factor of the Black-American solution. A second scale, "charming," which loaded on the White-American factor identified within this comparison also loaded on the first factor of the Black-American solution contained within the first comparison of similar factors. The second factor of the Black-American solution was incorporated within the first group of similar factors.

Collectively, the scales that loaded on the factors contained within the second comparison suggest a "physical/ social competency" attribution. The Composite factor indicates simply the importance of physical attractiveness. The White-American factor adds the importance of charm while the Chicano-American sample rejects a sexy appearance but feels an attractive person should be "nice." Six scale loadings define the three factors with two scales loading

on all three sample factors. The Composite and White-American factors share an additional loading and one scale loads uniquely to the Chicano-American and White-American factors. The Composite, the Chicano-American and White-American factors account for 5.5, 5.7, and 6.9 percent of the total variance and 13.7, 13.9 and 15.5 percent of the common variance, respectively.

The scales which loaded across the factor solutions in the third comparison relate to the "task" attractiveness of the other. The Composite factor implies that the other should have an ability to complete tasks, work independently, and be a good communicator who is of a similar age. The Chicano-American sample is not concerned about age but rather the intelligence of the other. The Black-American factor demonstrates not only concern for task completion but also the affective and physical attributes of the other. The White-American factor factor implies the importance of task but also of generalized respect and social responsibility in assessing interpersonal attractiveness. One scale ("ability to get the job done") loaded on all four factors; the scale "good communicator" and another scale ("keeps busy") loaded on all the factors except the White-American and Chicano-American factors, respectively. The Composite and Chicano-American factors share one additional loading as did the Chicano-American and Black-American factors. Six scales

were unique to the Black-American factor and two were unique to the White-American factor. The Composite, Chicano-American, Black-American and White-American factors accounted for 4.6, 24.4, 24.3, and 5.7 percent of the total variance and 9.4, 75.7, 74.6 and 11.3 percent of the common variance, respectively.

Sample population differences can be identified within the amount of variance explained by each factor solution. The White-American solution accounted for the most variance followed by the Black-American and then Chicano-American solutions. The Composite solution accounted for the least amount of variance. In addition, the White-American data generated a four-factor solution while the other three solutions were defined by three factors. Both the White-American and Black-American solutions were partly defined by a factor that was not interpretable. Likewise, the similar factors incorporated in the three comparisons account for differing amounts of variance. In comparison one, the Composite, Black-American and White-American factors accounted for the major proportions of the explained variance of the respective solutions while the Chicano-American solution accounted for a small proportion of the variance for its solution. A similar pattern is noted in comparison three. This implies that even when similar assessments are made by the various sample populations, the importance of these assessments varies from sample population to sample population.

Not only did the factors incorporated in the three comparisons of similar factors account for differing amounts of total and common variance, but the similar factors were also defined by different scale loadings. In the first comparison, an "affective/cognitive" attribution component was identified. Population differences can be noted in three areas. First, the Chicano-American was the only population to identify attraction based on his/her ability to help the attractive other while the Black-American and the White-American perceivers were concerned about the attractive other's ability to help him/her improve as a person and to feel good about him/herself. Secondly, the Black-Americans did not differentiate between affective/cognitive assessments and task competency. The first factor of the Black-Americans demonstrated not only a concern for the other being supportive and understanding but also indicated that the attractive other should be busy, a good communicator, able to get the job done, and intelligent. Finally, the Black-American group was not concerned if the attractive other had similar interests or views but rather placed emphasis on sharing "similar backgrounds."

In the second comparison, a "physical/social competency" component was identified. Differences are again noted. First, the scale "charming" (which loads on the White-American factor) and the scale "handsome (pretty)" (which loads on the Composite, the Chicano-American and the

White-American factors incorporated in this comparison) loaded on the first factor of the Black-American factor incorporated in this first comparison. This suggests that perhaps the Black-American population does not differentiate among affective/cognitive, task or physical/social attributions. That is, the Black-American group appears to have made more holistic assessments. Secondly, only the Chicano-American data indicated the importance of the attractive other being "nice."

The third comparison demonstrated a concern for "task" attractiveness. Similar assessments emerged in the other's ability to get the job done. As discussed earlier, the Black-American factor linked task considerations with social and physical attractiveness as well as supportiveness. In addition, the Chicano-American and Black-American factors placed emphasis on effective communication and intelligence; the White-American factors did not. Rather the White-Americans were concerned about generalized respect and a societal commitment. Only the Chicano-Americans were interested in the other being "independent."

CONCLUSION

Within the limits of this study, the population samples appear to have an impact on the determinants of interpersonal attraction. Differences were noted in the amount of variance

accounted for by each sample population factor solution. In addition, when similar factors were identified across the sample populations, these factors accounted for differing amounts of variance. This suggests that even when similar factors emerge across sample populations, these populations place differing degrees of importance on these factors in assessing interpersonal attraction. Finally, the scale loadings which defined similar factors varied across sample populations. Such variations indicate unique sample population attribution assessment. In general, the Black-Americans made more holistic assessments and did not differentiate among task attractiveness, social/physical attractiveness and affective/cognitive attractiveness. The Chicano-American sample population appears to have accepted more responsibility in facilitating the growth of the attractive other while the Black-American and White-American populations assigned attractiveness based on the other's ability to facilitate their growth. Finally, the White-American sample population seemed to be more concerned that the other possess generalized respect and a societal commitment than did the other two populations. The results of this study are evidence that the determinants of interpersonal attraction appear to be at least partly a function of culture.

The results of this study do identify differences. Yet only three populations were sampled. In each case the

resulting factor solutions accounted for small amounts of the total variability of the scale pool. This would suggest that additional differences exist and remain unidentified. Such findings are of theoretical importance. The results of this study also imply that some determinants of interpersonal attraction are common to the three populations sampled. Mortensen asserts that the "imprint of culture on communication does not rule out the possibility that some aspect of social interaction may be common to all cultures" (1972, p. 353). He further suggests that there may exist implicit rules of culture or "universal or pan-cultural" cues that are shared across cultures. The identification of such implicit rules, "universal or pan-cultural" cues, are of equal theoretical importance. Yet the theoretical importance of the populations sampled can only be ascertained if additional populations are sampled to more fully identify the impact of culture on interpersonal attraction.

Altman, J., and Taylor, D.A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Berger, C.R., Weber, M.D., Munley, M.E., Dixon, J.T. "Interpersonal Relationship Levels and Interpersonal Attraction." Communication Yearbook I, New Jersey: International Communication Association, 1977.

Berscheid, Ellen, and Walster, Elaine. Interpersonal Attraction, Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1978.

Blanchard, F., Adelman, L., Cook, S. "Effect of Group Success and Failure Upon Interpersonal Attraction in Cooperating Interracial Groups." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology and Supplement, 1975, 31, 1020-1030.

Blanchard, F., Cook, S. "Effects of Helping a Less Competent Member of a Cooperating Interracial Group on Development of Interpersonal-Attraction." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1245-1255.

Bleda, P. "Attitude Similarity-Dissimilarity and Attraction in Middle Eastern Culture." Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91, 153-154.

Brislin, R. W. "Interaction among Members of Nine Ethnic Groups and Belief-Similarity Hypothesis." Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85, 171-179.

Brooks, William D. Speech Communication, Dubuque: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers, 1977.

Burgoon, M., Heston, J.K., McCroskey, J.C. Small Group Communication: A Functional Approach, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Byrne, D. "Interpersonal Attraction as a Function of Affiliation Need and Attitude Similarity." Human Relations, 1961, 14, 283-289.

Byrne, D. The Attraction Paradigm, New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Byrne, D., Clore, G.L., Worchel, P. "Effect of Economic Similarity-Dissimilarity on Interpersonal Attraction." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 220-224.

Byrne, D., Griffitt, W. "Interpersonal Attraction." Annual Review of Psychology, 1973, 24, 317-336.

Byrne, D., Griffitt, W., Stefaniak, D. "Attraction and Similarity of Personality Characteristics." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 82-90.

Byrne, D., Gouaux, C., Griffitt, W., Lambert, J., Murakawa, N., Prasad, M., Prasad, A., Ramirez, M. "The Ubiquitous Relationship: Attitude Similarity and Attraction: A Cross Cultural Study." Human Relations, 1971, 24, 201-207.

Cattell, Raymond B. "Introduction to Benjamin Fuchter. "Manipulation and Hypothesis-Testing Factor-Analytic Experimental Designs." Cited in Raymond B. Cattell (ed.), Handbook of Multivariate Experimental Psychology, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966.

Emry, R.A. "Public Figure Credibility Dimensionality Population Sample Impact." Paper presented to Western Speech Communication Association Convention, San Francisco, November, 1976.

Freeman, H.R. "Reward vs. Reciprocity as Related to Attraction." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1977, 7, 57-66.

Griffitt, W.B. "Interpersonal Similarity as a Function of Self-Concept and Personality Similarity-Dissimilarity." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 581-584.

Heider, F. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations, New York: Wiley, 1958.

Hendrick, C., Page, H. "Self-Esteem, Attitude Similarity and Attraction." Journal of Personality, 1970, 38, 588-601.

Homans, G.C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Kiesler, C.A., Goldberg, G. "Multidimensional Approval to the Experimental Study of Interpersonal Attraction: Effect of a Blunder on the Attractiveness of a Competent Other." Psychological Reports, 1968, 22, 693-705.

Klapper, Joseph T. "What We Know About the Effects of Mass Communication." The Public Opinion Quarterly, 1968, 21, 453-74.

McCroskey, J.C., Larsen, C.E., Knapp, M.L. An Introduction to Interpersonal Communication, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971.

McCroskey, J.C., McCain, T.A. "The Measurement of Interpersonal Attraction." Paper presented to Western Speech Communication Association Convention, Honolulu, November, 1972.

Mortensen, David C., Communication: The Study of Human Interaction, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Newcomb, T. The Acquaintance Process, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Rummel, R.J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Sereno, K., Bodaken, E.M. Trans-Per: Understanding Human Communication, Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1975.

Seyfried, B.A., Hendrick, C. "Need Similarity and Complementarity in Interpersonal Attraction." Sociometry, 1973, 36, 207-220.

Singer, Marshall. "Culture: A Perceptual Approach." The Vidya, 1969, 3, 15-22.

Sote, G.A., Good, L. "Similarity of Self-Disclosure and Interpersonal Attraction." Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, 491-494.

Smith, Alfred G. Communication and Culture, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Thibaut, J.W., and Kelley, H.H. The Social Psychology of Groups, New York: Wiley, 1959.

Triandis, H.C. "Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Behavioral Component of Social Attitudes." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 68, 420-430.

Wilmot, William W. Dyadic Communication: A Transactional Perspective, Menlo Park: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1975.